

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/624,718	07/25/2000	Shinichi Yoshimura	112857-062	6804
29175 7.	590 10/20/2004		EXAMINER	
BELL, BOYD & LLOYD, LLC			KAO, CHIH CHENG G	
P. O. BOX 113 CHICAGO, IL			ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
CHICAGO, IL	2 00090-1133		2882	

DATE MAILED: 10/20/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	09/624,718	YOSHIMURA, SHINICHI	
navious notion	Examiner	Art Unit	
•	Chih-Cheng Glen Kao	2882	m
The MAILING DATE of this communication a	ppears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 04 October 2004 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Applexamination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	o avoid abandonment of this applic (1) a timely filed amendment whice (eal (with appeal fee); or (3) a time	ation. A proper replication at the state of	y to a ation in
PERIOD FOR	REPLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing	-		
 b)	ire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	ng date of the final rejecti	on.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the peri fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See	od of extension and the corresponding ame of the shortened statutory period for reply Office later than three months after the ma	ount of the fee. The appropriate of the final originally set in the final	ropriate extension Office action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appella 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.192(a)).			
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered	d because:		
(a) they raise new issues that would require fu	rther consideration and/or search	(see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Not	te below);		
(c) they are not deemed to place the applicationissues for appeal; and/or	on in better form for appeal by mate	erially reducing or sir	nplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without can NOTE:	celing a corresponding number of	finally rejected claim	S.
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rej	ection(s): See Continuation Sheet	<i>,</i> •	
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) wo canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	uld be allowable if submitted in a s	eparate, timely filed	amendment
5.⊠ The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request application in condition for allowance because:		idered but does NO	T place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered by raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ecause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which were	e newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendm explanation of how the new or amended claims			and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follow	/s:		•
Claim(s) allowed: <u>1-5 and 13-15</u> .			
Claim(s) objected to:			
Claim(s) rejected: 6-12.			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) a	pproved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stater	nent(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)		

EDWARD J GLICK SUPERVISOBY PATENT EXAMINER

10. Other: ____

Continuation of 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): The rejections of claims 1-5 and 13-15 under 35 USC 102(b) as being unpatentable over Miyawaki et al. (US Patent 5726439) have been withdrawn in light of Applicant's argument with regards to 35 USC 112, sixth paragraph, and means-plus-function language.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

Regarding claims 6-10, Applicant argues that the circuit of Miyawaki does not "adjust" the timing of the outputs. The Examiner disagrees, since generating timing pulses is a process of adjusting the pulse. Applicant states that in order for something to be adjusted (i.e., timing), it has to exist in the first place. The timing pulses of Miyawaki do exist in the first place. For example, when the pulse is in an on-state, it exists. When the pulse is in an off-state, it exists as well. Adjustments occur when the pulse is adjusted from an off-state to an on-state and vice versa. Therefore, Miyawaki disclsoes a timing adjusment step of adjusting a timing as recited in claim 6.

Regarding claims 11 and 12 and in response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., "timing adjustment means for adjusting a timing at which the result of the operation is output for each of said plurality of elements from said outputting units, said timing adjustment means using a control signal other than the clear signal or the transfer signal in the timing adjustment") are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims.